

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were pending in the application prior to entering this amendment.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14-15, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, in view of Partridge et al. (U.S. 6,160,811, hereinafter referred to as Partridge).

Claims 7-8, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, in view of Partridge, and further in view of Bakke et al. (U.S. 5,566,170, hereinafter referred to as Bakke).

Claims 2, 3-4, 11-13, and 16-18 were objected to and the examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 7, 15, and 21 have now been amended.

Claims 1-22 remain active in the application.

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 3-4, 11-13, and 16-18 were indicated as allowable, but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based upon the fact that the base claim is in fact allowable for the reasons explained below. Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be held in abeyance until a final determination is made relative to the base claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14-15, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Applicant Admitted Prior Art in Figure 2 (AAPA) of the instant application in view of Partridge. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as neither reference nor the combination of those references teaches all of the elements of any of the above rejected claims.

Claim 1 (which is representative of the claims listed in this rejection) as now amended recites a method of operating a network access server that includes:

"determining, from the results of the routing table lookup, a routing table identifier and a second processor responsible for processing and forwarding

*the received packet, the second processor selected from a plurality of forwarding processors in the network access server;
passing the identifier and the received packet to the second processor;
the second processor retrieving routing information for the received packet from a routing table, using the identifier to determine the location of the routing information in the routing table”(emphasis added).*

As correctly noted by the examiner, the admitted prior art in Figure 2 does not disclose 1) determining from a routing table lookup, a routing table identifier and a second processor responsible for processing the received packet , 2) passing the identifier received packet to the second processor and 3) the second processor determining the location of the routing information in the routing table,

The examiner also correctly notes that Partridge discloses a data packet router which also employs a plurality of forwarding engines, citing FE 33-35 in Figure 1. However, in fact, the main function of each of the forwarding engines FE 33-35 disclosed by Partridge is to make so called “next-hop” determination. (Partridge col 4, lines 21-23.) Particularly, in making this determination in the Partridge reference, ONLY the packet header is transmitted to the forwarding engine. The forwarding engine then returns the identity of the output port appropriate for the packet's next hop to the input port (see for example Partridge's Abstract). Thus, the forwarding engines FE 33-35 in Partridge, do not receive the actual packets and perform packet processing and forwarding as recited in Claim 1.

On the other hand, the forwarding processors recited in Claim 1 not only receive the actual packet, but also handle packet processing and forwarding. Thus neither Partridge nor the admitted prior art in Figure 2 disclose the limitations recited in Claim 1.

The above arguments apply, equally, to the other independent claims 9, 14-15. Dependent claims 5-6, 10, 19-20 depend on Claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively, and are allowable for the same reason as the parent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14-15, and 19-20.

Claims 7-8, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the admitted prior art, in view of Partridge, and further in view of Bakke.

First, claim 7-8 and 20-21 are dependent claims that are dependent upon previously discussed independent claims. Thus, these claims are patent for the reasons previously given relative to their parent claims.

Furthermore, claim 7 now amended recites

"the first processor passing a processing indication to the second processor, the processing indication informing the second processor as to what processing remains to be done on the packet is stored in an intraserver header".

The examiner states the Bakke discloses a pre-processor unit which includes a modifier device to perform necessary modifications to the media header such that subsequent processing of the protocol data units is reduced, citing Elements 104, and 126 in Figure 2. Bakke clearly states that the modification device is to perform necessary modifications to the media header based upon the determined media header information. Col 5, lines 5-10. In particular, the modification steps involved are, for example, decrementing a TTL, incrementing a hop count, or modifying a checksum (TTL, hop count, and checksum are information fields included in a packet header). Col 6, lines 5-12.

Claim 7 does not involve modification of the packet header information in order to inform the second processor as to what processing remains to be done on the packet. Claim 7 specifically recites that the processing indication information is stored in an intraserver header. An intraserve header is a temporary header that is different from a permanent packet header.

Thus, Bakke does not disclose the limitations recited in Claim 7. The above argument also applies to claim 21.

Claim 8 recites:

"the routing table identifier indicates the ingress port that the second processor should route the data in the received packet to"

Claim 20 recites:

"passing an indication of packet subclass to the second processor."

Neither the cited reference alone nor the combination teach or suggest passing the particular information as recited in Claims 8 and 20.

Thus, for either the reasons that these claims are dependent on allowable independent claims or for the specific recitations in these dependent claims, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7-8, and 20-21.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Elmer W. Galbi
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575